

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. The claim amendments are indicated above. No claims have been added or cancelled. Hence, Claims 1-88 are pending in this application. The amendments to the claims and the new claims do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, the amendments to the claims were made to improve the readability and clarity of the claims and not for any reason related to patentability. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed October 30, 2006 are addressed hereinafter.

CLAIMS 23-44 AND 67-88 FULLY CONFORM TO 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 23-44 and 67-88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter under the rationale that the subject matter recited by Claims 23-44 and 67-88 may include a wave, which is allegedly non-statutory subject matter.

Present Claims 23-44 and independent Claims 67 and 82, from which Claims 68-81 and 83-88 depend, clarify that each is directed towards either a computer-readable storage medium or an apparatus comprising a computer-readable storage medium. A wave, such as a carrier wave, is not a computer-readable storage medium because computer-readable instructions cannot be **stored** on a wave; at best, a wave may temporarily **carry** instructions, which when stored on a computer-readable storage medium, may be read by a computer. Accordingly, the rejections to Claims 23-44 and 67-88 made under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been overcome by the amendment and remarks made herein.

THE PENDING CLAIMS FULLY CONFORM TO 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3, 17, 25, 39, 60, 69, and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly indefinite. In particular, the Office Action suggested that certain occurrences of the

phrase “SNMP MIB” should recite “SNMP MIB object.” The present claims adopt the suggestion. Consequently, the rejection of Claims 3, 17, 25, 39, 60, 69, and 83 made under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph has been addressed and overcome.

THE PENDING CLAIMS ARE PATENTABLE OVER THE CITED ART

Each of the pending claims recites at least one element that is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by the cited art, either individually or in combination.

CLAIM 1

Claim 1 features:

receiving a management request containing one or more values comprising proposals for a correct value of a managed object of the managed device;

wherein the management request requests a determination as to whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object of the managed device;

determining whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object; and

completing execution of the management request by:

transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object.

(Emphasis added.) At least the above-bolded features of Claim 1 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by U.S. Patent No. 5,822,569, issued to McPartlan et al. (“*McPartlan*”).

The approach of Claim 1

In the embodiment recited by Claim 1, a management request is received. The management request requests a determination as to whether any of one or more values match a correct value of a managed object of the managed device. The management request contains the

one or more values comprising proposals for the correct value of the managed object. A determination is made as to whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object. Execution of the management request is completed by transmitting a notification message that indicates whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object.

The approach of *McPartlan*

McPartlan discloses sharply contrasting subject matter than that recited by Claim 1, as *McPartlan* lacks any teaching or suggestion of a management request as claimed. Instead, the cited approach of *McPartlan* states that upon receiving a request for an attribute value, a password contained in the request is checked. If the password is incorrect, then the request is ignored (Col. 9, lines 42-44). If the password is correct (Col. 9, lines 45-54), then a check is made as to whether an authorization identifier, accompanying the request, is valid. If the authorization identifier is not valid, then the request is ignored (Col. 9, lines 53). If the authorization identifier is valid, then a check is made as to whether the request itself is valid (Col. 9, lines 55-61). If the request is not valid, then the network manager is informed (Col. 9, lines 60). If the request is valid, then the request is performed (Col. 9, line 61).

While *McPartlan* does disclose an approach for retrieving an attribute value, *McPartlan* lacks any suggestion of a management request that requests a determination as to whether any of one or more values match a correct value of a managed object of the managed device, where the management request contains the one or more values comprising proposals for the correct value of the managed object. For example, the request of *McPartlan* does not contain any proposals for the correct value of the managed object. The approach of *McPartlan* suffers from some of the same disadvantages discussed in the Applicants background (see paragraph 7), because an

incorrect value stored for a first attribute value may prevent another entity from obtaining or verifying the correctness of values for other attributes, e.g., if the password of *McPartlan* is incorrect, then the request is ignored (Col. 9, lines 42-44).

Differences between Claim 1 and the Cited Art

Claim 1 features several elements that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *McPartlan*. For example, Claim 1 recites “receiving a management request that requests a determination as to whether any of one or more values match a correct value of a managed object of the managed device, wherein the management request contains the one or more values comprising proposals for the correct value of the managed object.”

The portion of *McPartlan* cited to show this element (Col. 9, lines 40-45) states, *in toto*: “On receiving a request for an attribute value, in a step S39, the SNMP application component checks if the request contains a valid password. If the request does not contain a valid password, the program continues with a step S40 in which the request is ignored.”

This portion of *McPartlan* discusses an approach of retrieving an attribute value from an SNMP application. However, *McPartlan* lacks any teaching or suggestion of determining whether the attribute value matches one or more proposed values. Instead, *McPartlan*, like other prior art discussed in the Applicants’ background, merely allows one to retrieve an attribute value. Retrieving an attribute value may require that certain information be presented in the request.

For example, as explained above, *McPartlan* requires that, in order to obtain an attribute value, a password be correctly supplied, a valid authorization identifier be presented, and the request itself be valid. However, as explained in the Applicants background (see paragraph 7), an incorrect value stored for a first attribute value (such as a password or authorization identifier)

may prevent another entity from obtaining or verifying the correctness of values for other attributes (such as the attribute value you are interested in). As a result, *McPartlan* suffers from the same disadvantage discussed in the Applicants background, because if an incorrect value is stored for the password or authorization identifier, the requestor cannot obtain the attribute value and will be unable to determine whether the password or the authorization identifier is a reason the request for the attribute value was ignored.

No portion of *McPartlan* suggests an approach for receiving a management request that requests a determination as to whether any of one or more values match a correct value of a managed object of the managed device. The management request of Claim 1 contains the one or more values comprising proposals for the correct value of the managed object; however, the request of *McPartlan* does not, since the request of *McPartlan* is of an entirely different nature than the management request of Claim 1. Consequently, this element cannot be disclosed, taught, or suggested by *McPartlan*.

Claim 1 also recites “completing execution of the management request by transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object.” No portion of *McPartlan* discusses completing execution of a request by transmitting a notification message indicating which value, previously supplied by the request, matches the correct value of the managed object.

The portion of *McPartlan* cited to show this element (Col. 9, lines 59-61) merely discusses the successful processing of a request for an attribute value. However, execution of the request of *McPartlan* is completed by transmitting the requested attribute value. This is different than completing execution of a request by transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of one or more values previously supplied values match the correct value of the managed

object. In order to determine the correct value of a managed object, the management request of Claim 1 requires that the management request contain the correct value of the managed object. On the other hand, the approach of *McPartlan* may be used to retrieve an attribute value without supplying the correct value of the attribute value.

The differences in the expressly recited features of Claim 1 over prior techniques, such as *McPartlan*, yield tangible advantages for a user of an embodiment as recited in Claim 1. For example, as explained with reference to one embodiment discussed in paragraph 39 of the Applicants' specification, if a user changes the prompt of a session of a managed device, one or more values associated with the changed prompt session may be proposed by a management station to determine the correct value associated with the changed prompt session. Using this technique, if a user changes the prompts of a session of a managed device, the management station may identify the changed prompt structure using the expressly recited features of Claim 1. Once the management station ascertains the identity of the changed prompt structure, the management station may be able to communicate with the managed device. Such an illustrative advantage is not possible using prior approaches, such as *McPartlan*. Consequently, the element of "completing execution of the management request by transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the managed object" is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *McPartlan*.

As at least one element recited by Claim 1 is not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *McPartlan*, Claim 1 is patentable over *McPartlan* and is condition for allowance.

CLAIM 16

Claim 16 features:

receiving a request containing one or more values comprising proposals for a correct value of an SNMP MIB object;

wherein the request requests a determination as to whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object of the managed device,

determining whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object; and

completing execution of the request by:

transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object.

(Emphasis added.) At least the above-bolded features of Claim 16 are not disclosed, taught, or suggested by *McPartlan*.

Claim 16 was rejected under the same rationale for rejecting Claim 1. However, as explained above with reference to Claim 1, *McPartlan* lacks any teaching or suggestion of the above-bolded features of Claim 16. For example, *McPartlan* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest a request for determining whether any of one or more values match a correct value of a SNMP MIB object of the managed device. The request of *McPartlan* does not contain one or more values comprising proposals for the correct value of the SNMP MIB object. Further, *McPartlan* lacks any teaching or suggestion of completing execution of a request by transmitting a notification message indicating whether any of the one or more values match the correct value of the SNMP MIB object. Consequently, for at least these reasons, Claim 16 is patentable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance.

CLAIMS 2-15 AND 17-88

Independent Claims 23 and 38 recite features similar to those discussed above with reference to Claims 1 and 16, except that Claims 23 and 38 are recited in computer-readable storage medium format. Consequently, for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to Claims 1 and 16, Claims 23 and 38 are patentable over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claims 45 and 60 recite features similar to those discussed above with reference to Claims 1 and 16, except that Claims 45 and 60 are recited in computer-readable storage medium format. Consequently, for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to Claims 1 and 16, Claims 45 and 60 are patentable over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Independent Claims 67 and 82 recite features similar to those discussed above with reference to Claims 1 and 16, except that Claims 67 and 82 are recited in computer-readable storage medium format. Consequently, for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to Claims 1 and 16, Claims 67 and 82 are patentable over the cited art and are in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88 are dependent claims, each of which depends (directly or indirectly) on one of the claims discussed above. Each of Claims 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88 is therefore allowable for the reasons given above for the claim on which it depends. In addition, each of Claims 2-15, 17-22, 24-37, 39-44, 46-59, 61-66, 68-81, and 83-88 introduces one or more additional limitations that independently render it patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, to expedite the positive resolution of this case a separate discussion of those

limitations is not included at this time, although the Applicants reserve the right to further point out the differences between the cited art and the novel features recited in the dependent claims.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and the issuance of a notice of allowance is respectfully requested. If there are any additional charges, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if the Examiner believes that such contact would be helpful in furthering the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP



Christopher J. Palermo

Reg. No. 42,056

Date: **January 30, 2007**

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110-1089
Telephone: (408) 414-1080 ext. 202
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076